

To: Margaret Kirkpatrick
(margaret.kirkpatrick@nwnatural.com)[margaret.kirkpatrick@nwnatural.com]
Cc: (jworonets@anchorage.com)[jworonets@anchorage.com]; Cami Grandinetti[Grandinetti.Cami@epa.gov]; Yamamoto, Deb[Yamamoto.Deb@epa.gov]; Robinson, Deborah[Robinson.Deborah@epa.gov]; Koch, Kristine[Koch.Kristine@epa.gov]
From: Cohen, Lori
Sent: Wed 3/11/2015 12:01:55 AM
Subject: Portland Harbor - followup to 3/10/15 meeting
2015-02-23 Figure 2.2-2 PRG-Footprints.pdf

Hi Margaret,

I want to thank you and the other LWG team for meeting with us yesterday in Seattle. I think Debbie Robinson's follow up to the meeting summarizes our agreements and next steps; please let her know if there are any items she missed. In addition, there is one item I want to comment on as I thought about it more after the meeting and read some of the FS text -- this has to do with the map in Section 2 of the FS that was provided to the LWG in the draft FS section 2 document. The map is attached for your reference.

First, it is important to note that this map is part of a *draft* section of the FS that we have asked the LWG to comment on, and the LWG comments are due later in the month as we discussed.

We expect the LWG to comment on this map and other parts of the document. It is disturbing to me that this map is being highlighted from the draft and possibly causing some unnecessary "spin". I sincerely hope this is not the case as I think we can address the concern you all raised by adding some clarifying language in the final document. This can probably be worked out at the staff level.

Second, I would like to provide some context as to why this map is included in the draft FS. As you know, the Feasibility Study will identify cleanup technologies for addressing contamination that exceeds Preliminary Remediation Goals. Preliminary Remediation Goals are standards used to determine where contamination in a site exceed risk levels or regulatory standards. As noted in Section 2, there are a variety of cleanup technologies being evaluated at this site: dredging, capping, monitored natural recovery, enhanced natural recovery, institutional controls, treatment, monitoring, and no action. At this step in the process (FS section 2), we are simply relaying facts about the site and are not yet making any conclusions about what a remedy should or shouldn't be at any particular location within the site. Figure 2.2-2 illustrates where in the site study area there are concentrations that exceed the Preliminary Remediation Goals. Consistent with FS guidance, this is a first step in the process of identifying areas for cleanup and other sections of the FS will refine the cleanup approach throughout the site.

Again, the LWG has an opportunity to provide comment on the draft Section 2 language and we can modify as appropriate for the final. As we discussed yesterday, we all agreed it is important to honor the process we established for the LWG to raise concerns with staff first, and then elevate to management if the issue cannot be resolved at the staff level.

Thank you,

Lori

Ccing J Woronets to share with the LWG senior managers and Project Managers... thank you!